

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Amendments to the Specification

By way of this reply, paragraphs [0016], [0027] and [0033] have been amended to address various inconsistencies within the specification. Specifically, the aforementioned paragraphs have been amended to change all instances of "virtual network address" to "virtual address."

Paragraphs [0016], [0023], [0027], [0028], and [0029] have been amended to clarify that the virtual address is associated with the recipient. Support the aforementioned amendment may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0027], [0029], [0031], and [0032] of the specification.

Paragraph [0027] has been further amended to clarify that the result of the Supernet Attach command is three items: (i) a virtual network address corresponding to an IPv6 address of the recipient, (ii) the Supernet ID and (iii) the Channel ID. Support for the aforementioned amendments may be found, for example, in paragraph [0028] and Figures 5-6 of the specification.

Paragraph [0027] has been further amended to correct a typographical error. Namely, one instance of "IPv4" was corrected to "IPv6". Support for the aforementioned amendment may be found, for example, in paragraph [0027] of the specification. Further, paragraph [0031] has been amended to correct a typographical error. Support for the aforementioned amendment may be found, for example, in Figure 6 of the specification. Finally, paragraph [0032] has been amended to correct a typographical error. Support for the aforementioned amendment may be found, for

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

example, in paragraph [0026] of the specification. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned amendments.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-13, 15-27, and 29 were pending in the application.* Claims 5 and 12-13, and 15-26 and 27 are cancelled by the reply without prejudice or disclaimer. Further, new claims 30-37 are added by this reply. Claims 1 and 30 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 30.

Claim Amendments

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that (i) the virtual address is associated with a process on the recipient computer system and (ii) that the security context includes the virtual address, a Supernet identifier, and a Channel identifier. In addition, various elements of the claim were cancelled to clarify the scope claim. Finally, various portions of independent claim 1 were amended to address clarity and antecedent basis issues arising from the aforementioned amendments to independent claim 1. Support for the aforementioned amendments may be found, for example, in figures 5-7 and paragraphs [0027]-[0033] of the specification.

Claim 4 has been amended to make claim 4 consistent with amended independent claim 1. Support for the aforementioned amendments may be found, for example, in figures 5-7 and paragraphs [0027]-[0033] of the specification. Finally, claims 6 and 7 have been amended to be clarify the scope of the claim and to update the listing of claims from which they depend.

* The listing of pending claims on the Office Action Summary appears to be incorrect.

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner in the "Response to Arguments" Section of the Office Action mailed March 13, 2006, has maintained the previously asserted rejection of independent claims 1, 15, and 29. Specifically, the Examiner has reasserted that claims 1, 15, and 29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the document titled "Network Working Group Request for Comments: 1241" by R. Woodburn and D. Mills (hereinafter "Woodburn"). Claims 15 and 29 have been cancelled by this reply. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. To the extent that this rejection may still apply to amended independent claim 1, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

On page 8 of the Office Action mailed September 8, 2005, the Examiner admitted that the Woodburn does not teach a security context, where the security content comprises a Supernet identifier, a channel identifier, and a virtual address. Accordingly, Woodburn does not teach or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, amended independent claim 1 is patentable over Woodburn. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-13, 15-27, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Woodburn in view of the document entitled "IPv6 The new Protocol for Internet and Intranet, published 12/12/97" ("Silvano"). Claims 5, 12, 13, 15-27, and 29 are cancelled by this reply. Accordingly, this rejection is now moot with respect to the cancelled claims. To the extent that this rejection applies to remaining amended claims the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

As discussed above, Woodburn fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Further, Silvano fails to teach or suggest that which Woodburn lacks.

Amended independent claim 1 requires that the security content include: (i) a Supernet identifier (*i.e.*, an identifier corresponding to a Supernet), (ii) a Channel identifier (*i.e.*, an identifier corresponding to a Channel), and (iii) a virtual address, where the virtual address is associated with a process on a recipient computer system (*i.e.*, the computer system that is the destination of the packet that comprises, among other components, the security context and data encrypted using the security context).

Turning to the rejection, the Examiner has asserted that the teachings directed to the application of the Authentication Header (AH) and the Encrypted Security Payload (ESP) in Silvano teach or suggest the security context comprising the Supernet identifier, the Channel identifier, and the virtual address (*See* Office Action mailed March 13, 2006, p. 8). The Applicants respectfully disagree. With respect to the AH, the Applicants assert that the AH does not teach or suggest any of the aforementioned components in the security context. Moreover, the AH is not even involved in the encryption of data. Specifically, the AH is used to ensure the integrity and authentication of the data (*i.e.*, the data that was sent from the source corresponds to the data that was received at the destination). However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the AH even remotely includes any of the aforementioned components of the security context or that the AH is even used to encrypt the data.

Further, the ESP also does not teach a security context comprising the components recited in amended independent claim 1. Specifically, the ESP only corresponds to encrypting data using a cryptographic key. However, there is no indication that the cryptographic key includes the Supernet

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

Identifier and the Channel Identifier are components of the cryptographic key. Further, there is no indication that the ESP is even associated with a virtual address. In view of the above, neither the AH nor the ESP teach or suggest a security context as recited in the claims. Further, even assuming *arguendo* that Silvano teaches a security context including the Supernet identifier, the channel identifier, and the virtual address, there is no teaching or suggestion in Woodburn or Silvano that the security context is a 128 bit value (*see* claim 6), that the security context includes a 16 bit set and 112 bit set, where the 16 bit set denotes a site local internet protocol address and the 112 bit set comprises contiguous bits for the Supernet identifier, the Channel identifier, and the virtual address (*see* claims 7-9), or that the 112 bit set comprises a 64 bit Supernet identifier, a 24 bit Channel identifier, and a 24 bit virtual address (*see* claim 10).

In view of the above, the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the invention recited in pending claims. Accordingly, the pending claims are patentable over the cited referenced. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Claims 30-37 have been added as new claims by this reply. Claim 30 is an independent claim disclosing a for processing a security context. Support for the subject matter of claim 30 may be found in, for example, Figures 5-7 and paragraphs [0027]-[0033] of the specification. No new matter has been added by new claim 30.

Dependent claims 31-35 substantially correspond to pending claims 6-10. Support for the subject matter of claims 31-35 may be found in, for example, original claims 6-10 and paragraphs [0027]-[0033]. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned claims. Finally, new

Application No.: 10/037,800

Docket No.: 16159/035001; P6566

claims 36 and 37 substantially correspond to the subject matter of cancelled claims 13-14. No new matter has been added by any of the aforementioned claims.

The aforementioned claims are patentable over the cited referenced for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 1 and claims depending therefrom.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 16159/035001).

Dated:

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants

Attachment (Clean Copy of Specification Amendments)

153434_1